

REMARKS

Claims 20-41 are pending. This Amendment amends claims 20-38 and adds new claims 39-41. Claims 20, 23, 32, 34, 36, 39, and 41 are independent.

The Claimed Invention

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention, as recited by, for example, independent claim 39, is directed to a household device for treating objects that includes a dosing device for dispensing a treatment agent, a first readable memory storing first data regarding one of a composition of the treatment agent and an active parameter for the treatment agent, a second readable memory storing second data regarding the dosing device, a reader in communication with the first readable memory and the second readable memory, and a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data.

Conventional dishwashers and washing machines (household devices for treating objects) dispense a treatment agent merely upon a predetermined position within a treatment cycle and/or upon reaching a predetermined condition inside the device. These devices suffer from several problems. For instance, these devices do not ensure that conditions within the device are advantageous after the treatment agent is released. Therefore, the treatment agent may become inefficient for lack of appropriate conditions within the device.

Further these devices are not capable of providing a dosage of the treatment agent which would provide for best efficiency of the agent. Rather, these devices typically release all of the agent or a predetermined amount of agent. Therefore, the dosage of the agent is not adapted to make the agent more efficient.

In stark contrast, the present invention provides a household device for treating objects that includes a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data or a program

controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data. In this manner, the household device improves the efficiency of the treatment agent.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 20-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This Amendment amends claims 20-38 in accordance with Examiner El Arini's very helpful suggestions. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The DE'408 Reference

The Office Action rejects claims 20-24 and 26-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable in view of the DE'408 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a household device for treating objects that includes: 1) operating a first part of an identification system to identify data of a second part of the identification system that comprises information on a dosing device (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36); 2) a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data (claim 39); and 3) a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data (claim 41). As explained above, these features are important for improving the efficiency of the treatment agent.

Rather, and in stark contrast, the DE'408 reference merely discloses a computer that controls the machine to provide an amount of product based upon product bar code reading. The DE' 408 reference does not teach or suggest data regarding the dosing device at all (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36), controlling the treatment of objects to

optimize the ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent at a predetermined time (claim 39) and also does not teach or suggest controlling the time of dispensing of the treatment agent to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent (claim 41).

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The WO'864 Reference

The Office Action rejects claims 20-24 and 26-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable in view of the WO '864 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a household device for treating objects that includes: 1) operating a first part of an identification system to identify data of a second part of the identification system that comprises information on a dosing device (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36); 2) a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data (claim 39); and 3) a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data (claim 41). As explained above, these features are important for improving the efficiency of the treatment agent.

The WO '864 reference merely discloses controlling a washing program according to the read information. The WO '864 reference does not teach or suggest data regarding the dosing device at all (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36), controlling the treatment of objects to optimize the ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent at a predetermined time (claim 39) and also does not teach or suggest controlling the time of dispensing of the treatment agent to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent (claim 41).

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The GB '078 reference

The Office Action rejects claims 20-24 and 26-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable in view of the GB '078 reference. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a household device for treating objects that includes: 1) operating a first part of an identification system to identify data of a second part of the identification system that comprises information on a dosing device (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36); 2) a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data (claim 39); and 3) a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data (claim 41). As explained above, these features are important for improving the efficiency of the treatment agent.

Rather, and in stark contrast, the GB '078 reference merely discloses transferring data regarding the kind, metering quantity, and dose concentration from a bar code on the treatment agent packaging to an electronic control. The GB '078 reference discloses calculating appropriate metering quantities based upon this data. (Page 2, lines 17-19, 41-43, and 56-57).

The GB '078 reference does not teach or suggest: 1) a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data (claim 39); and 2) a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data (claim 41).

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The DE '408 or WO '864 in view of the EP '927 reference

The Office Action rejects claims 25 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the DE '408 reference or WO '864 reference in view of the EP '927 reference.

As explained above, neither the DE '408 reference nor the WO '864 reference teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a household device for treating objects that includes: 1) operating a first part of an identification system to identify data of a second part of the identification system that comprises information on a dosing device (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36); 2) a program controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time based upon the first data and the second data (claim 39); and 3) a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent based upon the first data and the second data (claim 41).

The EP '927 reference does not remedy the deficiencies of either of the DE '408 reference or the WO '864 reference.

Rather, and in stark contrast, the EP '927 reference discloses a self-contained and portable dispensing device that detects and/or senses when the conditions are optimal and then releases the agent. The EP '927 reference very clearly does not teach or suggest data regarding the dosing device at all (claims 20, 23, 32, 34, and 36), controlling the treatment of the objects at all, let alone a controller that controls the treatment of the objects to optimize ambient conditions for dispensing the treatment agent from the dosing device at a predetermined time as recited by independent claim 39.

Further, the EP '927 reference very clearly does not teach or suggest controlling the time of dispensing of the treatment agent at all, let alone a program controller that controls the time of dispensing of the treatment agent from the dosing device during the treatment of the objects to optimize the effectiveness of the treatment agent as recited by independent claim 41.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned should the Examiner have any questions.

Applicant also petitions for an extension of time if one is required.

Respectfully submitted,



Russell W. Warnock

Registration No. 32,860

September 14, 2007

BSH Home Appliances Corp.
100 Bosch Blvd
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
russ.warnock@bshg.com